ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Visit of Mr. Max Hugel, DDA, to the Foreign Service
Institute, School of Language Studies

FROM: C/LS 426 C of C		EXTENSION	NO.
			DATE 6 April 1981

STAT

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
	RECEIVED	FORWARDED		
1. EO/DDA 7D-24 Hqs.	6 APR 1981	6 APR 1981	*mfc*	
2. ADDA	4-6		*H*	DD/A REGISTRY FILE: _Training_
3. DDA	4/6/81		*mh*	
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				

FORM 610 USE PREVIOUS EDITIONS
1-79

6 April 1981

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

FROM: [   ]
Chief, Language School

SUBJECT: Visit of Mr. Max Hugel, DDA, to the Foreign Service
Institute, School of Language Studies

1. Mr. Max Hugel, Deputy Director of Administration
accompanied by [   ] Chief, Language School visited
the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) Language School on
31 March. Our host was Pierre Shostal, Director of the
School of Language Studies. Mr. Shostal introduced Mr. Hugel
to Ambassador Paul Boeker, Director of the Foreign Service
Institute. In a 15-minute conversation with Ambassador Boeker
we were informed that the Foreign Service currently fulfills
67% of its overseas language-designated positions. We also
discussed the language requirement for Foreign Service
Officers which demands a professional level competence in at
least a world language for the Foreign Service Officer to
move from probationary to tenure status. Their incentive
program concentrates on "hard" languages. Competence in any
of the fourteen hard languages will result in a 10% bonus
when used abroad and 15% for native level competence.

2. In Mr. Shostal's office we discussed their language
school which trains about 2,000 per year (600 at any one
time) and is manned by 200 instructors--69 of which have
tenure, i.e., permanent slots. Mr. Shostal stressed the
following points in indicating the direction of language
training at FSI:

   a. Training for the assignment. A concentration
   on core skills such as how to ask questions, how to
   make a presentation (e.g., on arms control), how to
   address a complaint to police authorities. The program
   is outlined in the attached policy paper dated
   28 January 1981.

   b. Short courses designed to meet the requirements
   of spouses, secretaries, clericals, etc., who need to
   have mobility primarily for morale purposes.

SUBJECT: Visit of Mr. Max Hugel, DDA, to the Foreign Service
          Institute, School of Language Studies

      c. Overseas training, although a necessary adjunct
up to training given at FSI, will probably be cut.

    3. Mr. Shostal spoke of the usefulness of the interagency
process whereby FSI received input regarding course content
and programs from CIA, AID, Defense, Agriculture, and Commerce.

    4. Mr. Shostal stressed testing for communicative and
comprehension capacity. He felt that grammar has been over
emphasized. Testing he said to Mr. Hugel's agreement should
measure effectiveness.

    5. This appeared to be a useful hour in a school which
is closest to CIA's Language School in method and training
programs.

STAT

Attachment

2

POLICY PAPER

The School of Language Studies has recently undertaken an intensive review of its language programs. A central objective of the review was to arrive at a determination of the degree to which these courses prepare students from our various client agencies for the kinds of communication tasks they will encounter on assignment overseas. Is a consular officer, for example, linguistically prepared to protest the mistreatment of an American prisoner; does an AID official have the communication tools to convince a group of village elders of the need for a family planning program? A corollary aim of the review was to determine the feasibility of providing comprehensive training in basic language structures while at the same time maintaining the flexibility to train for the kind of functional language use needed in the foreign affairs milieu.

In the past, SLS has often been called upon to make informal adaptations of its programs to accommodate specialized student, agency or U.S. mission needs. We have not, however, taken the further step of formulating a statement of policy with regard to meeting specific requirements for language use. The importance of foreign language proficiency or the lack of it to the conduct of U.S. affairs is currently the subject of intense public scrutiny, which clearly indicates this to be an appropriate time to reexamine our mandate -- as we are doing with the SLS Program Review -- and to begin to focus our efforts on the kind of progressive, professionally-relevant, task-oriented training which will meet the functional needs of our clientele. We believe such a focus can provide the School with a unity of purpose that will make language training more effective and provide client agencies a better return on their substantial investments in training. Levels of general language proficiency previously identified with professional competence are increasingly being found insufficient. In some instances, students who succeed admirably in training have encountered serious difficulty in putting the language to work upon arrival at post. The need to measure the success of our programs by the degree to which they prepare students for the tasks of the agencies served is manifest.

SLS will henceforth have as its central objective the provision of language training which develops language use competence appropriate to the job needs of U.S. Government employees serving abroad. We will endeavor to prepare students for the duties and functions of positions in U.S. missions abroad which carry language requirements. Our aim will be to provide the motivated, hard-working student with the functional equivalent of S-3/R-3 or better. We are fully aware that professional and social language needs frequently overlap in the realm of foreign affairs and this

will not go unrecognized in the adaptation of programs. We
intend to train for language use in the context of job-
related needs, whatever the scope of the job or the variety
of speaking, reading, writing and comprehension skills
required.

Reference to the new thrust of SLS training as "job-
related" does not mean simply the addition of specialized
vocabulary to existing courses, but the development of
communication skills dedicated to problem resolution and
tasks to be performed. It is not only words and forms
which must be practiced and learned if language is to be
made a usable communication tool, but the communications
tasks themselves. Acknowledging the difficulty of adapting
programs in specific terms to the diverse job requirements
of the many agencies serviced by SLS, we intend to concen-
trate training efforts on the broader functional aspects of
foreign affairs work which cut across job and agency
lines. If, for example, the functional objective of the
moment happens to be the ability to formulate inquiries
aimed at eliciting useful information, a communication task
is defined which can encompass the needs of a visa officer
doing interviews, a political officer seeking opinions on
upcoming elections, a military attache trying to gain
information about troop deployments, an Agricultural
attache looking for projections on crop yields, etc. In
the area of aural comprehension skills, a functional
objective might be the ability to follow an exposition or
conversation in the target language in which the student is
not a participant. The appropriate classroom activity
might involve some team teaching with two or more native
speakers working together with combined classes. We
believe that by viewing "job-related" language needs in
this way, rather than redesigning traditional drill and
dialogue exercises around an exhaustive analysis of over-
seas job descriptions, we will be serving true communica-
tive competence. Moreover and more importantly, it will
allow the student practice in accomplishing tasks which are
germane to needs and can be worked with and practiced at
all levels of language proficiency. Thus, immediately
after the student has been introduced to a given structural
or syntactical point he/she will be required to "get
something done" with it in a meaningful communication
context.

Persons on assignment who do not have a directly job-
related need for the language (spouses, non-LDP officers,
officers not assigned abroad, people on language probation)
are welcome to enroll in the new courses, provided they
have an interest in functional communication goals and
foreign affairs subject matter, and with the knowledge that
many areas of language use which may be pertinent to their
needs (shopping, recreation, household problems, non-
professional travel) will not be integral parts of the

they may be addressed peripherally. The same high
standards of performance and achievement in the language
will apply to all students.

Students' success in language training will not be
evaluated solely against the absolute measurement of the
language itself but also against functional objectives.
Utilizing the same scale of relative proficiency as at
present, SLS testing will give greater emphasis to func-
tional communicative competence and will interpret
proficiency level definitions to include the professional
context and task resolution, with the ultimate goal of
measuring the student's ability <u>with</u> the language rather
than in it.

Development and implementation of the training program
described here extends beyond SLS, and will require cooper-
ation and participation of other parts of FSI, especially
SAS. Much of the subject matter of the new program will be
area-relevant. Thus, the program both builds on and
broadens the joint program of language and area studies
which SLS and SAS have been developing.

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. FSI will be in <u>touch with the agencies</u> serviced by
the School in the coming weeks to procure information as to
their field needs for eventual incorporation into the
design of all programs. The nature of the information
sought will be along broad functional lines rather than
detailed "job descriptions." The data collection process
has already begun with a questionnaire concerning job-
related language use which has gone out to some 50 posts.

2. The next phase of the SLS Program Review will
identify for each program the <u>steps to be taken in adapting
current curricula</u> to the new orientation. The Program
Review will be taken over at this stage by the newly
created Department of Program and Staff Development (PSD).

3. A series of <u>seminars and working groups</u> will be
undertaken by SLS to prepare staff members in both an
<u>informational</u> and pedogogical sense to adapt to new
requirements. The design and implementation of this
program will be the responsibility of the PSD.

4. PSD will be tasked with review of proficiency
definitions and the development of <u>testing procedures</u> to
measure the kind of functional communicative competence
appropriate to foreign affairs work. To be completed by
August 1981.

5. In the adaptation of present courses cultural and area studies components will be incorporated into the course rather than identified as appurtenances to a basically grammar-focused approach. In order to facilitate this, appropriate SAS staff members will be designated to work with PSD.

6. All courses will be required to reflect substantial job-related methodological and conceptual content by August 1981. Fully-developed job-related programs are targeted for August 1982. Standards for course content will be promulgated by SLS Management.

PROGRAM CONCEPTS

Summary

In the past, SLS linguists and staff have been
called upon to take the initiative in determining what
the appropriate content of individual programs should
be. Consequently, we have seen considerable variance
in terms of priorities and little continuity in the
School curriculum. There has also been a lack of spec-
ific guidance that would help course designers focus
on the professional foreign language needs of the SLS
clientele.

Steps are currently being taken by SLS management
to provide the School with unifying policies, objec-
tives, priorities and standards by which the success of
its curriculum may be measured. An investigatory
phase, the Program Review, marks the beginning of the
promulgation of these specifications. This paper will
discuss the findings of the review committee, the is-
sues involved in adapting training to perceived needs
and the actions recommended to implement new policies.
The discussion will necessarily concentrate on areas
requiring change, which should not give the impression
that there is not a great deal about current programs
worth preserving or that the negative aspects are being
unduly emphasized. The process of adaptation to new
requirements will take time, and we do not intend to
rush things to completion at the expense of clarity or
quality. The process will also take everyone's help in
SLS, but in our view this does not represent additional
work so much as a recasting and reemphasis of present
efforts.

It is our belief that many of the language ele-
ments now included in the long-term courses are rele-
vant, and necessary for 3/3 competence in any context.
The problem is that these elements are "studied"--dis-
sected, analyzed, memorized--rather than absorbed and
practiced in the kinds of communication tasks which
will be encountered overseas.

Our initial objective, then, will be to implement
some philosophical and methodological changes and
innovations by the August, 1981 starts, an undertaking
which we believe can be made within the confines of our

FY-81 Financial Plan at least to the extent that we can reprogram some activities. What will thereafter emerge in terms of resource implications from the contracting sessions with individual program designers (Program Review, Phase III) about the adaptation of their courses remains to be seen. We do expect, however, that additional resources may be required in the FY-82 budget to cover costs of some materials development projects and staff development, but it would be premature to attempt at this time to place a dollar figure on what they might be. We expect to have a good grasp of this issue in a few weeks.

Language vs. Language Use

Perhaps the most difficult assumption, philosophically speaking, with which management must come to grips in SLS is that of the primacy of language itself in the training. Some programmers appear to have confused the need to provide a thorough grounding in the language with their professional desire to be comprehensive, even exhaustive, in explaining it. Hence some courses, rather than take up a point of grammar or vocabulary strictly in the context in which it appears, attempt to deal with it at once in every context in which it could possibly appear. Training is, after all, for an assignment, not for a lifelong relationship with the language, and there is neither time nor a real need to teach everything.

Decisions must be made in SLS about which aspects of language are appropriate for students given their professional objectives. Ultimately, the assignment needs of the student must take precedence in reaching such decisions.

It is management's intention to pursue a pragmatic, professionally relevant course in training which emphasizes language use over an encyclopedic theoretical knowledge of language.

Dealing More Effectively with Students' Assumptions, Expectations and Anxieties

All SLS courses need to provide the student with an adequate explanation of what lies in store for them in the course, what the purposes and objectives are for various activities, the rationale for methods employed,

the nature of the effort that is expected of them and the results that could conceivably be anticipated. Various reasons for the fact this is not currently being done became manifest during the review: some linguists believe they must ultimately accommodate to the expectations and opinions of students, rather than convince them of the appropriateness of another way of doing things; some are loathe to create expectations that might not be realized; some take no active part in the conduct of the course. Basically, however, most courses have not defined any long or short term objectives about which students could be informed other than that of learning "as much of" the language in question as possible.

A systematic approach to keeping the student informed about course design and procedures need not signify rigidity or inflexibility. Certainly the staff cannot be expected to lay out a firm schedule of events applicable to all students for an entire year. It is equally certain, however, that choices have been made about the best way to teach the course—what to focus on, how to sequence the material, what the benefits might be of a given exercise, what students should be able to do to achieve various results. It is a basic tenet of adult education to make such things explicit, both verbally and in writing, in order to reassure students about the efficacy of what they are doing and to keep the training on track. Doing this in some formalized fashion will address the most frequent post-training complaints which are about disorganization, wasted time and irrelevance of various elements of the course. For those SLS courses which depend for their success upon the talents, motivation or personality of a single instructor, even that fact should be explained, as well as what the advantages are to such a system.

The more students know about what is expected of them, the easier it will be to provide proper guidance and counseling and to do something about inadequate performance. There is a schoolwide need for improved guidance and counseling, and we will be informing the staff of requirements in this context.

Ultimately, each course will develop a set of written guidelines to be provided to students explaining in general terms the procedures, objectives, methods and expectations which characterize the

course. To initiate this effort, we intend to develop
sample guidelines for one current language program,
under the direction of the new Department of Program
and Staff Development, to be completed by May 1, 1981.
All other courses will be expected to produce such
guidelines by August 1981, though these may need to be
altered somewhat in the course of adaptation to new
requirements.

Flexibility of Materials

One characteristic of SLS noted frequently in the
program review is the significance attached to the
development of "perfect" long range materials,
requiring years to develop, which are intended ulti-
mately to be the foundation of the course. If the
objective of such an emphasis is merely to find better
ways of teaching the grammar, rather than of using the
language, then the effort--relative to the time and
resources consumed--is misplaced. The effort to
develop such an "anchor" to the course must not lead
to the neglect of other important aspects: pedagogy,
counseling, the development of functional capabilities,
etc.

It is worth noting that some of the most success-
ful programs are taking advantage of short-range, ad
hoc, current and disposable materials (relatively
quickly designed) which provide flexibility and high
relevance to functional, job-related tasks. While
students are generally more comfortable with a compre-
hensive text from which they can study independently
and which provides theoretical background to what is
being done in class, this does not mean that such a
text need dominate, much less comprise a course. It
may be sufficient to provide a springboard to an array
of useful materials without making the student too
heavily dependent on it.

We must avoid any focus on textbook materials
which might lead to the treatment of work-related and
cultural elements as optional add-ons which have come
at the end of the course after the grammar has been
covered. Otherwise the implication to students will be
clear: anything not focused on the text will be seen
as disruptive, distracting, and unnecessary and hence
rejected. The School to some extent makes this a

Materials development projects will be evaluated
by the Department of Program and Staff Development
according to how they are intended to meet functional
course objectives as opposed to any universal applica-
bility they may have. Course design should be the
determinant from which the utility of a textbook should
follow. To the extent possible, texts should be
designed as an impetus to other pedagogical classroom
activities and provide the student with a reliable
reference and workbook for self study.

Management of our Methods

It is essential that the responsibility not be
left to the students for the job-related and cross-
cultural aspects of language use which are to be
focused on in the courses. The assumption that
students know what they will need in the country of
assignment is easily made and often untrue. Situations
can be deceptively similar in a field as broad as
foreign relations and experience is of limited help to
someone who may indeed have done similar work in
another country, but under an entirely different set of
assumptions and conditions. It should be the responsi-
bility of the individual programs to make the best
possible assessment of the kinds of language and
cultural interaction which will be most useful and to
impress upon the students the reasons why what they are
doing is relevant. To force students to make these
decisions about what is important is to invite
criticism about the disorganization of the course.

Special professional materials and activities must
be accompanied by guidance to the student regarding
objectives and task orientation. Only limited peda-
gogical use is being made of the materials that are
available at present. The objective in most cases
seems to be conversation _about_ the materials at hand
(VTRs, newspapers) and acquisition of vocabulary from
them rather than the performance of prescribed tasks
and functions involving them. Once again the impetus
is left to the students to define the purpose of such
activities by the degree to which they participate in
the conversations. This seems yet another bias in
favor of language itself rather than accomplishing
anything with language.

It is essential to make task completion and problem resolution an integral part of job-related language study; to carry classroom activities to some logical conclusion, even if it involves nothing more than making a telephone call to set up an appointment or doing a memcon from a video-taped speech. Something should be achieved which makes sense in the professional realm but is not so specific as to limit its relevance to a class of diverse students.

To help the SLS staff become better acquainted both with the tasks to be performed by its clientele using the language and with methods which allow meaningful practice of such tasks during training, a series of seminars and workshops under the Department of Program and Staff Development will commence in March.

Making S/R Scores Work for Us

A characteristic of many programs is, in the absence of schoolwide performance criteria, the heavy reliance on S/R ratings to define both the objectives of a course and success in completing it. In view of our new orientation and the need to define proficiency in broader ways it is clear that S/R definitions need to be interpreted in functional terms to take into account performance objectives which go beyond the traditional mastery of grammar and vocabulary. The attention of the various agencies sending people to language training will inevitably be fixed on the designation of the position that is being trained for. It is therefore incumbent upon the School to translate the various S/R ratings into meaningful, concrete, functional terms which will be recognized as the objectives of the training itself rather than a general competence defined by a number.

SLS needs to give S/R scores broader significance to encompass communicative competence in a formal way. PSD will be tasked with reviewing proficiency definitions and development of testing procedures.

Training Objectives

While most linguists and instructors with whom we have spoken see no insurmountable obstacles to students achieving at least S-3/R-3 scores in the time allotted (Chinese, Arabic, Korean and Japanese are exceptions),

the response to such a proposition in those languages taught for only 20 weeks (Spanish, French, Italian, Portuguese and German) was highly sceptical. Nevertheless, we must aim for a significantly higher proportion of students achieving S-3/R-3 in all languages. More practice in functional language use will help, as will other program adaptations currently underway or contemplated. However, we will need to experiment with other techniques as well, including materials enrichment and an accurate measurement of the extent to which a somewhat longer training period produces meaningfully higher comptence. This will be a long-term effort and no general change in the 20-week duration of these courses is now planned, though a pilot program of 24 weeks may be undertaken in one of them on an experimental basis.

Training the Trainers

SLS is undertaking an ambitious and extensive self-evaluation and restructuring, the success of which ultimately relies on the dedication and creativity of the staff. It is, therefore, essential that new linguists and instructors be offered training opportunities which adequately prepare them for the tasks they are to perform.

To meet this need, SLS/PSD will begin to prepare separate orientation programs for new linguists and instructors to acquaint them with both organizational objectives and job requirements and standards. The target date for the completion of these programs is August, 1981.

CORRECTION FOR PROGRAM CONCEPTS PAPER

The last sentence on page 4 should read:

The School to some extent makes this a self-fulfilling prophecy in its materials by establishing the primacy of language structure over language use.

by Doug Jones, M/FSI/SLS/PSD

Two basic approaches appear to me to characterize present SLS courses regarding the objectives of classroom language training. The first is procedural, cumulative, and additive, stressing fundamentals, structural control and comprehensiveness, patterns and variations, mimickry and dialogues. It is basically linear. The second may involve aspects of the first, but in a less systematic fashion, focussing on student-perceived needs and having as a primary objective some student-generated attempts at natural conversation in the target language; working with what a student wants to say. It is basically cyclical.

A problem with the first method is that the student may become too passively dependent on a language stimulus to which he must respond. The second, on the other hand, presumes conversational ability to be an end in itself. Neither really focusses on seeing to it that the student is able to accomplish anything with the language he knows.

SLS management has called for a reorientation of our language training efforts around task resolution and functional, job-relevant language use. Among the many problems that will be taken up by the Department of Program and Staff Development in SLS (PSD) will be that of defining "jobs" and job needs in the foreign affairs agencies in a way which will be useful in the design of program activities. No less a problem will be that of designing courses for students with a wide variety of professional needs and tasks to perform without fragmenting the training.

I believe most of my Foreign Service colleagues would agree that it would serve little purpose to try to describe in detail the role and functions of the "typical" political officer, cultural affairs officer, security officer, etc., and to try to design courses around their job descriptions. The variables of country, specialty, mission requirements, job scope and personal work habits and style combine to make distortions of such stereotypes. The same is no doubt true of the job specialities of the many other agencies whose employees receive training at SLS. Anything specific enough to help tailor a language program would not have sufficient applicability to all students; anything general enough to be acceptable to all would not be workable.

The key to resolving this dilemna lies, I believe, not in the job characteristics themselves (though it is useful to know as much about them as possible), but in the nature

of the tasks required to carry them out and in the
varieties of language useful in doing so. An analysis of
these factors may have more meaning for course designers
than one centering on various job specialties. We can
probably generalize with less distortion about language
functions than about job functions. This paper will deal
in both an analytical and a descriptive way with some of
the typical broad tasks and language use requirements
common to foreign affairs work. It is hoped we will soon
have additional data from the agencies other than State to
supplement and refine my examples, which are drawn largely
from my own Foreign Service experiences.

A.   Oral Proficiency.

Several aspects of language production common to the
Foreign Service milieu will be discussed here and more will
undoubtedly suggest themselves. Each can be worked with at
various levels of language proficiency and in a variety of
situational settings. What is important is to make them
count for something rather than to allow speaking practice
to stand alone as an accomplishment -- to focus on the
utility of what is being rehearsed.

1.   The ability to formulate questions aimed at
eliciting useful information of a professional nature. A
distinction should perhaps be drawn here between soliciting
fact and opinion. A consular officer conducting a visa
interview generally requires only a simple, polite,
straight-forward questioning skill. His clients are, after
all, coming to him for services and he is primarily
interested in determining the facts in order to make a
responsible decision: "May I see some evidence that your
family will support you while you are studying in the
U.S.?" "What were the circumstances of your arrest and
conviction in 1946?" Such questions need to be focussed,
direct and clear, aimed at an illuminating response.
Though a certain delicacy may be required in obtaining such
information, the situation is somewhat different from that
of an officer trying to elicit an informative opinion or
information which has larger, less personal implications.
Thus the Labor Attache may draw out a union official with:
"I don't suppose these rumors of a transportation strike
should be taken too seriously?" Or an internal political
officer might resort to flattery with an important regional
official: "In view of the popular support for your
programs, might you be considering running for national
office next year?" Or an economic officer to a local
entrepreneur: "But don't you think a tariff on imported
widgets would ultimately hurt local industry more than it
would help?"

Such questions look somewhat artful and stilted on paper. In these and the other examples which follow, the cultural context in which they would sound appropriate is of course missing. Each language would have to rephrase them in the manner most appropriate to the prevailing cultural parameters, before they can aspire to realism. Nevertheless, I think the functional need is clear enough in this case: the use of language as a catalyst to gain information.

2. _The ability to raise a concern or objection, politely but firmly. To express disagreement with an action or position. To make a point or to persuade a listener._ A lot of ground is covered here. The consul may need to protest to prison officials the mistreatment of an American prisoner; a commercial attache might try to convince a potential investor to "buy American"; the press attache may take umbrage, on behalf of the Ambassador, at a misrepresentation of a U.S. position in the opposition press; the DCM may wish to communicate to the Foreign Ministry that the local record of human rights violations could lead to the curtailment of economic aid; the cultural attache may wish to convince a leading author to make an exchange visit to U.S. universities; a military attache may inquire why a region of the country has been declared off limits to U.S. personnel; an AID technician may have to convince local farmers of the need for a better irrigation system.

The important characteristic here is that such situations involve the volitional, aggressive production of language by someone who has a point to make in achieving a professional objective. In some cases, a high degree of formality may be required, in others almost none. The important thing in practicing this skill is to fulfill a verbal "assignment" in getting one's point across; something that can be worked with, even at primitive levels of language competence. In designing classroom activities appropriate to this kind of language use, program developers may wish to consider working with simulated adversary relationships which put a controlled amount of "constructive pressure" on the student to make his point.

3. _The ability to formulate a request that an action be taken._ This function gets us very solidly into the realm of problem solving and is common to all overseas USG agencies in one way or another. The speaker is required to request assistance in some matter which he cannot resolve personally. There is, therefore, a need for both precision of expression and an element of "manipulative" explanation, thus:

Consular officer to local coroner: "I realize an autopsy isn't required in a case like this, but the family and employer of the deceased would like one done for insurance purposes. Can you help us?"

Political officer to Foreign Ministry contact: "Congressman Crass would like to lay a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier during his visit. Can this be arranged?"

Regional Security Officer to Chief of Police: "In view of the recent demonstrations, I believe it is necessary to increase the guard around the Ambassador's residence. Can you assign an extra man to this detail?"

Air Attache to Defense Ministry official: "Please arrange flight clearances for the two aircraft transporting the official U.S. delegation to the state funeral of Prime Minister Gurke."

U.S. narcotics official to Security Officer: "Would you please check on the status of our extradition request involving Irving Smack and inform us whether we need to submit any further paperwork?"

Obviously the situation is the determinant in all these examples, but generally speaking the objective is to obtain an agreement or a commitment to take some specific action; to impress upon the contact the responsibility for that action.

4. The ability to explain -- even in simple terms -- a U.S. position, action, policy, point of law, national, value, etc. This may be seen as the obverse side of #2 above. Here a more defensive language "posture" is emphasized in response to a stimulus: a challenge, inquiry, misinterpretation, etc. Generally, some narrative skills are required -- the ability to put together an argument, exposition or explanation cohesively and to hold the floor. Ambassador Harry Barnes has identified this as the need to be able to advocate a position. At higher language levels it may also involve debate. Related to this may also be the need to stall, evade, filibuster or defuse the argument. Some examples:

Political officer to a student group: "I know this is an important issue between our countries, but I don't think we can expect a decision as early as you suggest. Let me explain how our treaty ratification process works...."

Visa officer to applicant: "Under U.S. law your affiliation with the Communist Party renders you ineligible for a regular tourist visa. There are, however, waiver procedures which may be invoked. This is what you must do...."

Cultural affairs officer to local artist: "I'm afraid the U.S. government cannot sponsor your project. I would be happy to suggest some private institutions, but I just don't think you would get much support for a twelve foot statue of Benedict Arnold. Here's why...."

Ambassador's Secretary: "I'm sorry, we cannot accept a collect call. Please tell the General we will return his call."

5. <u>The ability to speak effectively on the telephone</u>. Each country seems to have its own idiosyncratic telephone behavior which can totally confuse the unprepared foreigner -- even those with considerable language competence. This is an ability which cuts across the functions previously mentioned -- questioning, requesting, explaining, narrating -- compounding the difficulty of all of them by taking away the visual cues normally involved in personal communication. On the other hand, the speaker has the advantage of preparing what he wants to say (provided he is initiating the call). In view of the amount of USG business conducted by telephone, this is perhaps an aspect of language competence which should be given more attention and practice in SLS.

6. <u>The ability to "say the appropriate thing" in a social context, based upon cross cultural awareness</u>. This is not simply a matter of small talk or ritual greetings and niceties, but involves an informational use of language which can help establish a person's professional credentials, indicating an awareness of the inner workings of society, knowledge of local sensitivities, etc. Cultural affairs officer to Education Ministry official: "I understand your son has been admitted to the university. This must be a great relief and a proud time for you." Consular officer to District Attorney: "The behavior of these two tourists is of course deplorable, but unfortunately it is not uncommon for our young people to take foreign flags as souvenirs of their travels without considering the implications. It is certainly not something we would tolerate at home. I think, however, that if we can avoid prosecution, full restitution and an apology will be made."

This function applies to all employees who need to "get something done" with language but will, of course vary as a person's professional contacts vary. Thus, while the

cultural officer may well decry the chaotic Athenian
traffic to a university professor, he will probably not
add: "Things were no doubt more orderly under the Junta."
A military attache, however, might well allude to the Junta
period in a professional sense when talking with a Greek
counterpart about comparative state of military prepared-
ness, and do so without giving offense.

7. <u>Soloing</u>. Three functions are linked here, which
are somewhat specialized but require a significant amount
of practice and preparation: delivery of prepared public
remarks; delivery of extemporaneous public remarks and;
functioning as an interpreter. The first two are most
frequently indulged in by our ICA colleagues, though FSOs
are sometimes called upon to represent the Mission on some
special local occasion or holiday and to make remarks.

The interpreter function is also very much ad hoc.
The Ambassador or DCM may take a language qualified officer
along to a professional meeting because he does not wish to
rely on local interpreters, or on a show-the-flag visit to
a local factory, Trade Fair, etc. Or, an officer may be
designated as control officer for a CODEL or other visiting
U.S. dignitary and serve as interpreter as well.

B. Aural Comprehension.

It has been said that, as a people, Americans are far
more willing to talk than to listen. One hopes this is not
true of professionals in foreign affairs, where it is
crucial not only to understand the meaning of what is said
but the significance as well.

1. <u>The ability to follow an exposition or conversa-
tion in which one is not necessarily a participant</u>.
Whether one is following events at a public gathering
(political rally, trial, etc.) or just plain eavesdropping
on someone else's conversation at a cocktail party, the
information gathered constitutes data unedited for effect
on the incidental listener and therefore theoretically a
more reliable measure of opinion.

Most language programs place heavy emphasis on
participatory conversation, which leaves the student
probably more concerned with what he wants to say next (and
how to say it) than what is being said to him. The impor-
tance of participatory conversation for the production of
language is undeniable, but no less emphasis should be
placed on hearing the language spoken between (or among)
native speakers in a manner which makes no allowance for
what the student is likely to know or understand. And

this, preferably, with a host of background noises and other disturbances -- a setting far more in keeping with what is actually encountered abroad. The ability to follow this kind of conversation and provide feedback is very much in line with professional requirements.

2. <u>The ability to follow and understand the broadcast media</u>. It is particularly important for political and ICA officers to understand the <u>way</u> news is covered by the local media and therefore the impression the populace is likely to have based on this coverage. It is, of course, also important for everyone in order to know what is going on. Most programs in SLS that I know anything about have materials which reflect an understanding of this need.

3. <u>Having a feel for the national humor</u>. There is a perceived need on the part of many foreign service personnel to be able to participate actively in jesting, both folk wisdom and X-rated humor. The reasons are fairly obvious: it helps create rapport by loosening formality and establishing a communality; it helps release tensions; it establishes an aura of friendliness quickly. On the other side of the coin, a knowledge of what one may and may not joke about can enable us to avoid giving unintentional offense.

C. Reading Skills.

1. <u>The ability to gist articles from the print media</u>. FSOs and other agency officers generally need to have at least skimmed the headlines and spotted articles of interest before ever settling down to work for the day. Being caught unaware at the Ambassador's morning staff meeting can be acutely embarrassing. A lot of classroom time can be wasted sitting with a dictionary translating articles word for word. A better exercise might be to hand each student a paper and give him 15 minutes to locate all articles on a general subject before selecting one or two to gist.

2. <u>Ability to recognize documents of an official nature</u>. This is particularly important for consular officers who are constantly called on to notarize strange looking documents or to make decisions (visas, citizenship, Federal Benefits eligibility) based upon the authenticity of documents submitted.

3. <u>Some knowledge of the national literature</u> (if there is one). This should include, I suppose "national thought" as well. It is of course particularly important for ICA work, but advisable for all, to have read a few

things in the original. While it is perhaps asking too much to require students to read Nietzsche or Freud in German, they should at least be aware that these were among the great stylists of the language. Surely some exposure to poetry, drama, prose and folk literature is possible in most languages.

D. Orthography.

Orthography has only limited direct applicability to professional needs, except for those who want to take notes directly in the language. Writing skill should probably remain an optional objective for most students. The serious student who becomes proficient in other aspects of the language usually makes an effort to pick this up individually. I do not believe much classroom time should be devoted to the task. Orthography seldom presents a problem in most languages.

In conclusion, I am not suggesting that these functional categories represent a comprehensive approach to language instruction. They represent rather some possible linchpins which can help focus and hold our courses together, providing the atmospherics for culminating classroom activities which will allow students meaningful practice in applying their newly-acquired skills.